

8.8 Socioeconomics

Socioeconomic issues relevant to the evaluation of environmental impacts associated with the proposed Tracy Peaker Project (TPP) include labor force, employment, and income; population and housing; public finance and fiscal issues; schools; and public services (including fire protection, emergency response services, law enforcement, schools, medical services, and utilities).

8.8.1 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

The laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) applicable to socioeconomic conditions and potential impacts of the proposed project include Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice), the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and school impact fees imposed by Lammersville Elementary School District and Tracy Joint Unified School District.

8.8.1.1 Federal

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations (1994), requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal actions on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has adopted the order, and the California EPA has established a working group for environmental justice concerns. The California Energy Commission (CEC) receives federal funding and therefore must address environmental justice concerns associated with projects under its permitting jurisdiction. Environmental justice concerns related to the TPP are addressed in Section 8.8.4.

8.8.1.2 State

Analysis of potential socioeconomic impacts attributable to the proposed project is based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA governs economic and social effects of a project to the extent that the effects result in physical impacts to the environment, such as substantial growth in population, displacement of a large number of people, or disruption or

division of the physical arrangement of an established community. Other potential impacts include changes in community interaction patterns, social organizations, social structures, or social institutions; effects on community attitudes, values, or perceptions; or substantial inequities in the distribution of project costs and benefits.

8.8.1.3 Local

California Code of Regulations, Sections 65770–65981 and 65995–65998, include provisions for levies against development projects near school districts. The levies are often called “school impact fees” because they go toward education. For commercial or industrial construction, San Joaquin County school districts levy a school impact fee of \$0.33 per square foot of chargeable, covered and enclosed space (Ohm, 2001). The determination of chargeable and covered and enclosed space within the perimeter of a commercial or industrial structure will be made by the building department of the city or county issuing the building permit.

8.8.2 Affected Environment

GWF Energy LLC proposes to build and operate the Tracy Peaker Project (TPP), a nominal 169-megawatt (MW) simple-cycle power plant, on a nine-acre, fenced site within a 40-acre parcel in an unincorporated portion of San Joaquin County. The site is located immediately southwest of Tracy, California, and approximately 20 miles southwest of Stockton, California. The TPP would consist of the power plant, an onsite 230-kilovolt (kV) switchyard, an approximately five-mile, 230-kV electric transmission line, an approximately 1,470-foot water supply pipeline (as measured from the fence line), an onsite natural gas supply interconnection, and improvements to an existing dirt access road approximately one mile in length. An approximately 5.2-acre area west of the plant fence line and within the 40-acre parcel would be used for construction laydown and parking. Figure 2-1 shows the regional location of the GWF site. Figure 2-2 shows the immediate site location of the GWF project, including the location of the proposed generating facility and the proposed transmission, water supply, and access routes.

Alameda and Contra Costa Counties border San Joaquin County on the west and are part of the larger San Francisco Bay Area metropolitan region. Sacramento County borders San Joaquin County on the north and is part of the Sacramento metropolitan area. Amador, Calaveras, and Stanislaus Counties border San Joaquin County on the east and south. Stockton, the San Joaquin County seat, is approximately 50 and 80 miles, respectively, from the cities of Sacramento and San Francisco. The city of Tracy is approximately 70 and 60 miles, respectively, from Sacramento and San Francisco. Economic and demographic information for San Joaquin County and the city of Tracy are presented throughout the section.

8.8.2.1 Economy: Labor Force, Employment, and Industry

In 2000, the total civilian labor force in San Joaquin County was 260,900 persons, and the unemployment rate was 8.8 percent (Table 8.8-1; EDD, 2001a). Of the incorporated cities in San Joaquin County, the city of Stockton represents 42 percent of the county labor force, followed by Lodi (12 percent), Manteca (9 percent), and Tracy (8 percent). Ripon, Lathrop, and Escalon each represent between 1.5 and 2.0 percent of the labor force. Lathrop had the highest unemployment rate (10.3 percent), followed by Stockton (9.2 percent), Tracy (6.5 percent), Manteca (6.2 percent), and Lodi (5.7 percent). The unemployment rates in San Joaquin County and six of its seven cities were higher than the state of California's unemployment rate (4.9 percent), as shown in Table 8.8-1. The agricultural nature of the economy in San Joaquin County results in seasonal employment fluctuations. Therefore, unemployment rates likely fluctuate throughout the year.

Table 8.8-2 shows 1999 and 2000 employment by industry for San Joaquin County. As shown in Table 8.8-2, the highest percentages of employment in San Joaquin County in 2000 were in services, government, retail trade, and manufacturing. In 2000, the services sector represented almost one-fourth of total employment in San Joaquin County. Government employment represented approximately 18 percent, retail trade 17 percent, and manufacturing 13 percent of total employment. Farm production and services represented less than one-tenth of total employment, and construction represented 6 percent (11,800 employees) of total employment in the county.

The State of California Employment Development Department (EDD) expects an average annual growth rate in nonfarm employment of 2.9 percent between 1997 and 2004. The San Joaquin Partnership expects expansion in the retail, service, office, and manufacturing sectors of the economy (SJP, 2001).

Recent years reflect slightly slower growth (i.e., San Joaquin County experienced a 3.6 percent average annual increase in non-farm employment between 1993 and 2000). During the same period, farm production and services increased by an average annual rate of 3.3 percent; however, from 1999 to 2000, farm production and services decreased by 4.4 percent (EDD, 2001c).

Several labor unions with local chapters in Stockton, the nearby San Francisco Bay Area, and the Sacramento area provide workforces for construction projects in San Joaquin County. Private and commercial contractors also operate in the county. Tables 8.8-3 and 8.8-4 present the availability of labor by construction craft for Alameda County and the three county area of Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin Counties, respectively.

Nonresidential uses near the TPP site include a nursery (approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site), the Tracy Municipal Airport (approximately three miles southeast of the site), and a fiber-optic repeater station (approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the site). Farming operations are interspersed throughout the project area; the closest farming operation is approximately 1,000 feet east-southeast of the TPP site.

8.8.2.2 Population and Housing

Population. San Joaquin County includes the seven incorporated cities of Stockton, Lodi, Manteca, Tracy, Ripon, Lathrop, and Escalon. The population of unincorporated San Joaquin County accounted for 23 percent of the total county population in 2000. Available historical and projected population data for San Joaquin County, its incorporated cities, and the state of California are presented in Table 8.8-5.

Annual average population growth rates (historic and projected) are shown in Table 8.8-6 for 1981 to 2010. San Joaquin County's population increased from 356,200 in 1981

to 566,628 in 2000, for an average annual increase of 2.5 percent. The county's population is expected to reach 840,738 by 2010 (SJP, 2001) and 884,375 by 2020 (CDF, 2001). The state as a whole grew 1.9 percent annually on average between 1981 to 2000, slower than San Joaquin County. The city of Tracy was the fastest growing city in the county between 1990 and 2000, with an average annual growth rate over 5 percent.

The California Department of Finance (CDF) expects the population of San Joaquin County to grow at an annual average rate of 2.5 percent between 2000 and 2010. CDF expects the incorporated areas in San Joaquin County to grow slightly faster, with the exception of Lodi, and expects the state to grow slower.

The closest residences to the project site include both farm homes and residentially zoned housing areas. The closest farming residence is approximately 0.4 miles east of the project site, and the closest residentially zoned homes are located in Red Bridge, a community in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Lammers Road and Shulte Road.

Demographics and Poverty Level. Both 1990 and 2000 Census data were used for this analysis, as 2000 Census data showing the number of minority residents (excluding only white non-Hispanic/Latino) had not yet been released in July 2001.¹

Census data from 1990 show that the demographic composition of San Joaquin County, the city of Tracy, and the census tracts in and surrounding Tracy and the TPP site is mostly white and living above the poverty level. Between 20 and 40 percent of the population in these areas was minority, and the remaining 60 to 80 percent was white Hispanic. Forty-one percent of San Joaquin County residents was minority, including nonwhite races and persons who listed themselves as Hispanic or Latino white. The same measure for the city of Tracy was 31 percent.

Based on the 2000 census, 42 percent of San Joaquin County was nonwhite, while 35 percent of the City of Tracy was nonwhite.² In 2000, about 6 percent of the residents of San

¹ The number of persons of nonwhite races was available for 2000 in June 2001. However, since Hispanic/Latino origin *by race* in 2000 was not available in June 2001, the number of Hispanic or Latino whites was not available, and therefore, the number of minority persons could not be estimated.

² The 2000 race percentages include all "one race" races except white, and the category of "more than one race."

Joaquin County listed themselves as “two or more races.” In terms of ethnic origin, 31 percent of the population in San Joaquin County was Hispanic or Latino in 2000. In Tracy, 28 percent of the population was Hispanic or Latino in 2000. Whether the minority percentage in the counties has increased since 1990 is not discernible, since the number of white non-Hispanics was not available from the 2000 census in June 2001.

In 1990, 15 percent of San Joaquin County residents lived below the poverty level, and 7 percent of city of Tracy residents lived below the poverty level. Table 8.8-7 shows the demographic profile and poverty statistics of San Joaquin County, the city of Tracy, and the census tracts near Tracy and the project area.

Table 8.8-7 indicates that less than half of each of the populations in San Joaquin County, the City of Tracy, and 11 of the 12 census tracts within six miles of the project site, are minority or low-income.

Housing. Housing information for San Joaquin County and its incorporated cities is shown in Table 8.8-8. In January 2000, the housing stock for San Joaquin County was an estimated 190,000 dwelling units, comprised of 73 percent single-family homes, 22 percent multiple-family dwellings, and 5 percent mobile homes or trailers. The residential vacancy rate for San Joaquin County was approximately 5 percent at that time, which was lower than the state of California’s vacancy rate of 7.4 percent, indicating a slightly tighter housing market in San Joaquin County.

The supply of temporary housing in San Joaquin County includes five chain hotels in the Stockton metropolitan area, with a total of approximately 670 hotel rooms (Birkett, 2001). Chain hotels in the city of Tracy have approximately 340 hotel or motel rooms. In addition, other small hotels are located outside of the city of Tracy (Malik, 2001).

8.8.2.3 Public Services and Utilities

Fire Protection and Emergency Response. The TPP site is located within the Tracy Rural Fire District, for which the Tracy Fire Department (TFD) provides fire protection. The TFD operates seven fire stations throughout their coverage area. The stations that would

respond to fire, emergency medical, and hazardous materials situations at the site (in order of increasing distance from the site) are Fire Station No. 97 (595 W. Central Avenue), Fire Station No. 94 (16502 W. Schulte Road), and Fire Station No. 95 (7700 W. Linne Road). Stations No. 94 and No. 97 both have a response time to the site of less than five minutes. The standard response to a structure fire is three engines, one truck, a battalion chief, and a minimum of 12 on-duty personnel (Mehring, 2001).

Each of the three stations has a triple combination pumper engine, equipped for basic medical life-support emergencies and containing hydraulic rescue tools. Stations No. 94 and No. 95 are staffed with two personnel each, and Station No. 97 is staffed with three personnel. All stations are staffed 24 hours per day, every day. The TFC employs 25 reserve firefighters who are available on an as-needed basis.

Medical emergency calls are handled by the closest engine, which would provide basic life support, and an ambulance, which would provide advanced life support. American Medical Response provides life support and staffs each ambulance with two personnel who provide advanced life support.

If needed, additional resources are available both locally and statewide, through the statewide mutual-aid system in which the TFD participates (Mehring, 2001).

Law Enforcement. The San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services to the project site. The department is approximately 20 miles northeast of the project site, at 7000 Michael Canlis Boulevard in French Camp, and is the location from which all officers are assigned (Fellers, 2001).

The Patrol Division of the department includes 132 sworn deputy sheriffs. Beat deputies work 10-hour shifts with rotating days off. Four shifts cover the 24-hour period: 6:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 4:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., and 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The project site is located within Beat No. 8, where at least one deputy per shift is on duty. The deputies on Beat No. 8 patrol the general area in a car and respond to calls for service on a priority basis. Other beats are available to respond in an emergency, as are other law enforcement agencies from surrounding counties within Mutual Aid Region IV, with which the

County Sheriff's Department has mutual-aid agreements. The Sheriff's Department works closely with the Tracy Police Department and the California Highway Patrol in this area (Fellers, 2001).

Schools. More than 109,000 students in grades K through 12 attend the 17 school districts in San Joaquin County. Seven of the 17 districts are unified; Stockton Unified School District is the largest unified school district, with 34,000 students. Seven of the 17 districts are small, rural, one-school districts, with student populations between 173 and 315 students (SJOE, 2001).

In San Joaquin County, approximately 122,000 students attended schools during the 2000/2001 school year (DOE, 2001). The project site is located within Lammersville Elementary School District (LESD) and Tracy Joint Unified School District (TSD). Table 8.8-9 shows current and projected enrollment and capacity for the schools in these districts. LESD educates students in grades K through 8, and TSD educates students in grades K through 12. The closest schools to the project site are Jefferson School, located beyond the town of Carbona, approximately five miles east of the site, and South Elementary, located approximately three miles northeast of the site, within the city of Tracy boundaries. LESD and TSD together charge developer fees of \$0.33 per square foot of covered and enclosed space for new industrial or commercial development. LESD receives \$0.23 of the \$0.33 developer fee, and TSD receives the remaining \$0.10.

LESD includes one elementary school and one home-school program (Lammersville Charter School). A planned community called Mountain House Town will be constructed over the next several years, approximately five miles northwest of the site. The community will be located west of Mountain House Parkway (formerly Patterson Pass Road), north of Interstate 205, south of the Old River, and would extend west to the Alameda County line. The developer is planning to build nine schools over the next 20 years to serve families in Mountain House. Because the housing will be constructed before the first school is constructed (in two years), Lammersville Elementary School might temporarily have as many as 250 additional students in attendance during the 2002/2003 school year. The increase will not be

permanent, and LESD plans to bring in eight portable classrooms to serve this temporary student population (Muela, 2001).

As shown in Table 8.8-9, the two school districts that serve the project site do not currently have more students than capacity. However, four individual schools within the TSD currently do exceed capacity. The District accommodates the additional students in three ways: (1) McKinley, Villalovoz, and Hirsch Elementary Schools are on a multitrack, year-round schedule, so that students attend classes in shifts, and more students can be educated than the building can actually hold at one time; (2) students are moved to schools that have excess capacity; and (3) portables are leased or purchased for use at the schools. The TSD plans to expand, depending on the availability of funding.

Training and technical educational facilities or programs in San Joaquin County include Andon College, California Human Development, contractors license courses, Heald Business College, license instruction schools, MTI Business College, Private Industry Council, and Western Truck School. The Hartsog Trade School is located in Lodi, and the ITT Technical Institute is located in Lathrop (SJP, 2001). San Joaquin Delta College in Stockton enrolls more than 15,000 students, and University of the Pacific, also in Stockton, has more than 4,000 students (SJOE, 2001). California State University Stanislaus-Stockton Campus, Humphrey's College, and National University are also located in Stockton (SJP, 2001).

Medical Facilities. San Joaquin County has seven hospitals, with over 1,100 beds. The county also has approximately 740 physicians, 3,000 nurses, 290 dentists, and 110 chiropractors (SJP, 2001). Health service facilities in San Joaquin County include the following:

- Dameron Hospital, Stockton
- Doctors Hospital, Manteca
- Kaiser Permanente, Stockton
- Lodi Memorial Hospital, Lodi
- St. Dominic's Hospital, Manteca

- St. Joseph's Medical Center, Stockton
- San Joaquin General Hospital Physical Medicine, Stockton
- San Joaquin General Hospital Women's Health, Stockton

St. Dominic's Hospital is approximately 16 miles from the project site and provides general medical and surgical services, including 24-hour emergency care; obstetrical and gynecological services; cardiac and intensive care; physical, speech, hand, and occupational therapy; pulmonary and cardiac rehabilitation; diagnostic imaging services; mammography services; and pain management services (San Joaquin County, 2001a).

Utilities. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electricity and gas to the area surrounding the City of Tracy (SJP, 2001). The TPP site is currently not served with potable water or sewer service. Nonhazardous wastes from the site could be disposed of at the Tracy Material Recovery Facility (MRF), located at 30703 South MacArthur Drive, operated by Tracy Disposal Company. The MRF is approximately six miles southwest of the project site, near the intersection of Highway 132 and Interstate 580. Tracy Disposal also provides recycling services at 99 West Sixth Street. Pacific Bell provides telephone service to the site area.

8.8.2.4 Public Finance and Fiscal Issues

For fiscal year (FY) 2000/2001, San Joaquin County adopted a revenue budget of approximately \$900 million, including enterprise funds of approximately \$129 million for the General Hospital, Stockton Metropolitan Airport, Solid Waste, and Solid Waste Closure. Revenue sources include aid from other governmental agencies (57 percent), charges for services (12 percent), other revenues (17 percent), property taxes (7 percent), other taxes (3 percent), and fund balances (4 percent). Table 8.8-10 summarizes the revenue sources for San Joaquin County for FY 1998/1999 through 2000/2001. The FY 2001/2002 budget had not been adopted in July 2001.

Table 8.8-11 shows how the FY 2000/2001 funds were allocated. The allocated percentage of the budget for each department and the percent change from the FY actual 1999/2000 budget are also shown.

Public assistance received the largest percentage of FY 2000/2001 budget appropriations (31 percent), followed by public protection (20 percent), and health and sanitation (20 percent). Other funds that received appropriations included general government (19 percent) and public ways and facilities (8 percent). Education, recreation, and the contingency reserve each represented less than 1 percent of total appropriations.

The sales tax rate on construction materials and supplies purchased in San Joaquin County is 7.5 percent, of which 1.75 percent goes to the county and into the general fund (Brown, 2001).

The net secured assessed value of property in San Joaquin County in FY 2000/2001 was \$25.9 billion, and the total property tax revenue collected was approximately \$342 million (Siojo, 2001). In San Joaquin County, 31 percent of the property tax revenue is distributed to schools, 26 percent to the educational revenue augmentation fund, 19 percent to the county general fund, and 11 percent to city funds and districts. Fire districts and redevelopment agencies each receive 4 percent of the property tax allocation, and road districts receive 1 percent. The following funds receive less than 1 percent of the total property tax revenue allocation (Siojo, 2001):

- County library
- Cemetery districts
- Drainage districts
- Flood control districts
- Lighting districts
- Other light, water, sewer, drain maintenance districts
- Mosquito abatement
- Reclamation and protection districts
- Sanitary districts
- Community service districts

- Water conservation districts
- Irrigation districts
- San Joaquin regional transit district
- Other districts

San Joaquin County assesses property tax on the project site parcel at a rate of 1 percent. The County also imposed an annual straight fee of \$78.54 that is linked to the square footage of the land, independent of the value of improvements. Of this amount, \$54.08 goes to a mosquito abatement fund, and \$24.46 goes to a groundwater investigation fund (Siojo, 2001).

8.8.3 Environmental Consequences

Local and regional socioeconomic impacts attributable to the TPP were determined by evaluating projected demands for resources from construction and operation of the TPP relative to existing conditions. Construction and operation of the TPP are not expected to result in significant socioeconomic impacts to the local area or region.

8.8.3.1 Significance Criteria

The criteria used in determining whether project-related socioeconomic impacts would be significant are presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Impacts attributable to the project are considered significant if they would:

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population;
- Induce substantial increases in demand for public services and utilities;
- Displace a large number of people;
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community; or
- Result in substantial long-term disruptions to businesses.

8.8.3.2 Economic Impacts

Construction. TPP construction would occur over 11 months, beginning in November 2001 and ending in September 2002. Primary trades in demand would include direct craftworkers (i.e., electricians, boilermakers, laborers, and pipefitters) and contractor staff. Table 8.8-12 illustrates the TPP schedule and shows the estimated construction personnel requirements by trade and month. Total construction personnel requirements would be approximately 966 personnel months, peaking at 178 personnel months during the fifth month of construction.

As shown in Table 8.8-2, San Joaquin County had approximately 10,300 construction workers in 1999. For the purpose of analysis, an estimated 50 percent of the construction workforce (89 peak workers) is assumed to commute from west of the project site using Interstate 580 (i.e., from San Francisco Bay Area counties such as Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara). Twenty-five percent of the construction workforce (45 peak workers) is assumed to commute from east of the project site using Interstate 205 (i.e., from the Stockton metropolitan area, and from southbound Interstate 5, which would include the Sacramento metropolitan area).

The remaining 25 percent of the construction workforce (45 peak workers) is assumed to commute from the south using Interstate 580 (i.e., from the cities of Modesto and Merced, Stanislaus and Merced Counties, respectively).

During the 11-month construction period, an average of 88 workers would work daytime shifts at the TPP site from Monday through Saturday. Based on the percentages above, an average of 44 workers would commute from the San Francisco Bay Area, an average of 22 workers would commute from Stockton/Sacramento and an average of 22 workers would commute from Modesto/Merced. Table 8.10-5 in Section 8.10 (Traffic and Transportation) shows the average distribution of the workforce. The project would draw from several labor unions located in the San Francisco Bay Area, the Stockton metropolitan area, and perhaps the Sacramento area as well. An adequate construction labor force exists within daily commuting distance to meet the increase in demand attributable to the TPP.

The total construction cost of the proposed project is anticipated to be approximately \$107 million. Table 8.8-13 shows that labor costs (including base wages, benefits, taxes, and overtime) would represent approximately 12 percent of the total cost. The remainder of the cost, approximately \$85 million, would be spent on materials, equipment, and other nonlabor items. An estimated \$3.3 million (3.5 percent) of the cost of construction materials, equipment, and other non-labor items would be spent in San Joaquin County (Lai, 2001).

Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Construction. Construction activity would create secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) within San Joaquin County and the surrounding region, depending on where labor originates, where labor income is spent, and where materials and supplies are purchased. Secondary employment effects would include indirect employment due to the purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction, and induced employment due to construction workers spending their income in the local area. Using an IMPLAN multiplier of 1.8³ for the area including San Joaquin County and its adjacent counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Amador, Calaveras, Stanislaus, and Santa Clara) and the average number of workers (88), the number of indirect and induced jobs supported during construction is approximately 70, for a total of 158 jobs in the eight-county area. The secondary employment impacts within San Joaquin County would be a small portion of the 70 employees, since construction employees would commute from outside the county, and a portion of the labor income earned from construction would be spent outside San Joaquin County. These impacts would be temporary, since they are attributable to temporary construction activities, and would lag behind the direct effects of construction by approximately six to 12 months.

Operation. The proposed TPP would begin commercial operation in July 2002. Operation and maintenance of the TPP would require one skilled full-time production operator at

³ IMPLAN Professional Version 2.0, copyright Minnesota IMPLAN Group, 1997. 1.8 was the industry employment multiplier (induced and indirect) for Sector #51, New Streets and Highways, for the study area including Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Amador, Calaveras, Stanislaus, and Santa Clara Counties. The New Streets and Highways category was used because the materials used for the plant will be similar to materials used for new streets and highways.

all times, and one on-call maintenance worker. The employees would not be new; they would be transferred from other facilities owned by GWF and would commute to the site on a daily basis.

The total cost of annual operation of the TPP would be approximately \$3.3 million, as shown in Table 8.8-14. Approximately \$140,000 (4.9 percent) of the costs would be operation labor,⁴ and \$2.7 million would represent contract labor and materials. Approximately 5.9 percent of nonlabor materials and supplies would be purchased within San Joaquin County.

Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Operation. Operation would support secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) similar to the impacts attributable to construction, except that the secondary impacts from operation would be permanent and would already be present because the jobs would be transferred, not new. The impacts would occur within San Joaquin County to the extent that operation materials and supplies are purchased locally. Using an IMPLAN multiplier⁵ for San Joaquin County of 2.6 and the number of production employees (one), the number of indirect and induced jobs supported during operation is approximately three jobs. The impact would lag behind the direct effects of operation by approximately six to 12 months.

8.8.3.3 Population and Housing Impacts

Construction. Construction of the project would not cause any substantial permanent population increases or changes in concentration of population, due to the temporary nature and relatively short time period of construction. Construction workers would be a temporary addition to the San Joaquin County population during the daytime. During the day, workers may purchase food and gasoline in the area. All workers would be daily commuters and will therefore not need overnight lodging. However, if workers require temporary lodging, lodging is available in the Tracy area and the Stockton metropolitan area, as discussed in Section 8.8.2.2. The temporary influx of construction workers would not place demands on the local lodging industry that cannot be met. The secondary (indirect and induced) impacts associated

⁴ The labor costs (labor income) would not be new. The income would be transferred from the facilities where the operations employees would originate and would likely be spent in nonlocal areas, since the employees are not expected to move residences.

⁵ IMPLAN Professional Version 2.0, copyright Minnesota IMPLAN Group, 1997. The industry employment multiplier (induced and indirect) for Sector #443, Electric Services, in San Joaquin County is 2.6.

with construction are not expected to result in a substantial impact on population or housing in the area. The number of secondary employees would be small and the jobs temporary. Housing availability and vacancy rates in the area indicate that any new residents associated with secondary employment attributable to construction would be able to find adequate housing.

Operation. TPP operation would not cause any permanent population increases or changes in the concentration of the population, because no new employees would be required to operate the TPP. When the facility is dispatched by the Department of Water Resources (DWR), operations personnel necessary to operate the plant would be provided existing GWF facilities. Employees are assumed to commute on a daily basis; therefore, permanent housing or temporary lodging would not be required. Operations support personnel would provide spending in the area surrounding the TPP for food, gasoline, and other miscellaneous items. However, this increase in spending would be insignificant relative to total spending in San Joaquin County. Secondary (indirect and induced) employment associated with operation is not expected to result in a significant impact on population or housing in the area, because secondary employment impacts would be very small and would not represent a change from existing conditions. The jobs on which secondary impacts are based would already exist, just not at the proposed site.

8.8.3.4 Public Services and Utilities

Fire Protection, Emergency Response, and Law Enforcement Services.

Construction of the proposed TPP would result in slight increases in demand for public services, as the construction workforce would average 88 workers on site, and construction would last approximately 11 months. San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department and the Tracy Rural Fire District would serve the project site during construction and operation. The increased demand for service would not be substantial in relation to the existing service areas for each department. The Tracy Fire Department has adequate resources to accommodate the additional demand placed on the department attributable to TPP construction and operation (Mehring, 2001). The San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department also has adequate resources to accommodate the additional demand placed on the Sheriff's Department due to TPP construction and operation (Fellers, 2001). See Section 2.3.2.1, Fire Protection Systems, for more information.

Schools. The construction and operation of the TPP would not result in an increase in the local student population or have an adverse impact on the ability of the school districts to provide educational services. Construction workers and production employees would commute to the site on a daily basis and are not expected to temporarily or permanently relocate with their families, due to the adequate nearby labor force and the short construction period. Few additional students would attend San Joaquin County schools as a result of TPP construction or operation.

The school impact fees resulting from TPP construction would support education in San Joaquin County. San Joaquin County's current school impact fee is \$0.33 per square foot of covered and enclosed structure space for commercial or industrial development (Ohm, 2001). The covered and closed structures to be built at the TPP site are approximately 5,000 square feet, which results in a school impact fee of \$1,650.00 to be paid by the owners of the TPP. Using the breakdown of property tax revenue allocations (see Section 8.8.2.4) and the increase in property tax revenues attributable to the project (Section 8.8.3.5), an estimated \$610,000 in property tax revenues would be generated for education in San Joaquin County on an annual basis. Thirty-one percent of the property tax revenue is distributed to schools; 26 percent goes into the educational revenue augmentation fund.

Medical Facilities. The impact of the TPP on the hospitals and ambulances in the area would not be substantial. Medical facilities would be able to accommodate any demand for additional services. See Section 8.7 (Worker Health and Safety) for more information about safety procedures during construction.

Utilities. The construction and operation of the TPP would not have a substantial impact on electricity, gas, sewer, water, or telephone service in the area. Plain View Water District would provide water for plant operations. The TPP includes construction of a natural gas pipeline less than 500 feet in length that would connect to the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) transmission pipeline No. 401 that runs through the TPP site, as discussed in Section 7.0 (Natural Gas Supply). The pipeline would be tapped in an area that is within the site boundaries. Construction would not affect agricultural production on the land adjacent to the site. In addition, a 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission line would be installed and would connect the

TPP to the existing Tesla Substation. The transmission line would be about five miles in length and would transect primarily agricultural land or open range land. As with the gas pipeline, the transmission line would be installed underground, and the land under which it passes would continue in agricultural use.

The TPP would obtain its industrial water for construction and operations from water entitlements that are held by the ownership of the land. The Plain View Water District would serve the TPP site with water from the Delta-Mendota Canal. Potable water for the facility personnel would be supplied by a bottled-water vendor. Wastewater from the project would be handled using a near-zero discharge system. A septic system would be installed at the site. Nonhazardous waste from construction and operations would either be recycled or disposed of at the Tracy Material Recovery and Solid Waste Transfer Station. Wood wastes would be recycled at the Tracy biomass plant. PG&E would continue to provide electricity transmission service at the TPP site.

8.8.3.5 Fiscal Impacts

Sales tax revenue attributable to purchase of construction materials and equipment would be approximately \$8 million. Approximately \$250,000 of the \$8 million would result from taxed purchases within San Joaquin County. Of the 7.5 percent sales tax, 5.75 percent would go to the State of California (\$190,000), and the remaining 1.75 percent (\$58,000) would go to the San Joaquin County general fund.

The school impact fees resulting from TPP construction would support education in the immediate project area in San Joaquin County and would be approximately \$1,650 as discussed in Section 8.8.3.4.

San Joaquin County taxes secured property at 1 percent of assessed value, unless other levies are added. For the project site parcel, the property tax rate is 1 percent, but an additional \$78.54 is charged per year, based on square footage. The net secured assessed value in San Joaquin County for FY 2000/2001 was approximately \$25.9 billion (Siojo, 2001). The total property tax revenue on the project site parcel would be approximately \$1 million, plus

\$78.54 annually. Assuming the assessed value of the project site parcel would increase by the value of construction (\$107 million), the increase in property tax revenue to San Joaquin County would be approximately \$1 million annually. The property taxes would be allocated according to the breakdown in Section 8.8.2.4. The valuation of the TPP is based on components related to its anticipated revenue-generating capability, including production capacity, amount and term of income stream, expenses, discount rate, and present value at the end of the term. Therefore, property tax revenue may vary annually, depending on facility revenue.

Assuming the materials and supplies portion of the nonlabor annual operations expenditures are approximately \$750,000, the TPP would make local purchases of about \$44,000 annually in materials and supplies. The purchases would generate approximately \$3,300 annually in sales tax revenue.

8.8.4 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations (1994), requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal actions on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations. The U.S. EPA has published several guidelines for addressing environmental justice issues, including *Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs* and *Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits* (U.S. EPA, 2000a, b).

In recent environmental justice analyses, the CEC has used the methodology provided in U.S. EPA guidelines. Under current U.S. EPA methodology and CEC practice, for potential environmental justice impacts to exist, an environmental justice population must be present within six miles of a project site, and the project must result in “high and adverse” impacts that affect such populations disproportionately. Under U.S. EPA guidance, an environmental justice population exists if the percentage of the population that is minority low-income is over 50 percent.

A six-mile-radius area centered on the TPP site includes parts of San Joaquin and Alameda Counties. In 1990, San Joaquin County and Alameda County residents were 41 and 47 percent minority, respectively (see Table 8.8-7). As shown in Figure 8.8-1, the six-mile-radius areas include parts of census tracts 39, 52.02, 52.03, 52.05, 53.02, 53.03, 53.05, 53.06, 54.03, 54.04, and 55 in San Joaquin County and census tract 4511.01/4511 in Alameda County. In 1990, the percentage of minority residents in the census tracts ranged from 21 to 75 percent. Census tract 39 had a minority percentage greater than 50 percent; however, a very small portion of census tract 39 is within the six-mile radius. This portion does not include a population center, as shown in Figure 8.8-1.

Census 2000 data indicate that the nonwhite population in San Joaquin County and Alameda County represented 42 and 51 percent, respectively, of the total population. In addition, the percentage of the population that was Hispanic or Latino in 2000 was 31 percent in San Joaquin County and 19 percent in Alameda County.⁶ The 12 census tracts within a six-mile radius ranged from 18 to 52 percent nonwhite, and from 18 to 71 percent Hispanic or Latino. Census tract 39 is the only census tract with a population greater than 50 percent minority.

In 1990, 15 and 10 percent of residents of San Joaquin and Alameda Counties, respectively, lived below the poverty level (see Table 8.8-7). The percentage of residents living below the poverty level by individual census tract within the six-mile-radius area ranged between 3 and 38 percent in 1990. Poverty statistics by census tract for 2000 were not available from Census 2000 in July 2001.

It is not likely that environmental justice populations exist within six miles of the project site. Census tract 39 is the only census tract within six miles that has a population that is over 50 percent minority. Seven of the 10 San Joaquin County census tracts within a six-mile radius are racially more white than the county as a whole. The Alameda County census tract within the radius is also more “white” than Alameda County as a whole. San Joaquin County is

⁶ Both 1990 and 2000 Census data were used for this analysis, because 2000 census data showing the number of minority residents (excluding only white non-Hispanic/Latino) had not yet been released in July 2001. The number of persons of nonwhite races was available for 2000 in June 2001. However, since Hispanic/Latino origin *by race* in 2000 was not available in July 2001, the number of Hispanic or Latino whites was not available, and therefore the number of minority persons could not be estimated for comparison to 1990 data or for true representation of a minority percentage.

racially similar to the state as a whole, and Alameda County has more minority residents than the state as a whole. The minority population in census tract 39 is not likely located within a six-mile radius of the TPP site (see Figure 8.8-1). In terms of residents living below the poverty level, all census tracts within six miles in both counties, except census tract 39, have relatively fewer persons living below the poverty level (as a percentage of population) when compared to the respective counties as a whole. Again, the low income population in census tract 39 is not likely located within the six-mile radius (see Figure 8.8-1). Alameda County's percentage of persons living below poverty level is two percentage points below the state average, while San Joaquin County's percentage is three percentage points above the state's average.

According to the San Joaquin County Public Health Services (Cho, 2001) and the Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (Browder, 2001), no known public health studies pertaining to environmental impacts have been performed by the county health department for specific populations within six miles of the project site. The California Department of Health Services, has not performed any health studies of populations within the six-mile radius (Neutra, 2001).

Major pollution sources within six miles of each project site include a sugar refining and processing facility, a glass container manufacturer, and an electrical generation facility (see Figure 8.8-1) (Cruz, 2001). During operation, the proposed project would also be a pollution source (see Section 8.1, Air Quality, for more information).

The VISTA Information Systems (VISTA) Environmental Database was searched for records of hazardous sites within six miles of each of the project sites (VISTA, 2001).⁷ The

⁷ VISTA database lists include hazardous waste sites permitted by U.S. EPA (Toxic Release Inventory Sites) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Databases were searched for properties within a six-mile radius of the site, according to availability of data. Databases searched to six miles included U.S. EPA's National Priority List and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) corrective actions, and the state equivalent priority list. Databases searched to 5.5 miles include the U.S. EPA RCRA-permitted treatment, storage, and disposal facilities; sites under review by U.S. EPA [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)/No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP)]; the state-equivalent Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability System (CERCLIS) list; leaking underground storage tanks; and solid waste landfills, incinerators, or transfer stations. Databases searched to 5.25 miles included the state/county-registered underground storage tanks list and the state's registered aboveground storage tanks list. Databases searched to 5.125 miles included U.S. EPA's RCRA-registered small or large generators of hazardous waste, and the U.S. EPA/State Emergency Response Notification System and state spills lists.

locations and summary descriptions of the sites are presented in Figure 8.8-1. VISTA reported the following records:

- 95 sites with leaking underground storage tanks
- 24 sites with an emergency response notification of spills classification
- 3 sites listed in the Toxic Release Inventory database
- 50 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)-registered small or large generators of hazardous waste
- 54 sites listed in the State index of properties with hazardous waste
- 3 RCRA violation/enforcement actions

The hazardous site nearest to the project site reported by VISTA is approximately 0.2 miles northeast of the project site (see Figure 8.8-1).

8.8.5 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative adverse socioeconomic impacts can result from a project if construction or operational demands, when combined with similar demands from one or more other projects in the region, exceed or undermine available resources. Projects approved by San Joaquin County include a 200-acre automobile auction facility approximately three miles northwest of the site, and about 20 small projects totaling approximately 100,000 square feet under the County's Special Use Plan. Planned projects that have not yet been approved include three commercial/industrial and/or mixed-use projects, and possibly one residential-use project in Tracy. The proposed project, together with the approved and planned projects, is not expected to result in substantial increases in population that would increase demand for public resources beyond what is currently available in the area. The combination, number, size, and type of projects are not indicative of a large population in-migration. The projects would result in some increases in employment and population (including accompanying increases in income and spending) that would represent an economic benefit to the area. Cumulative impacts on population are expected to be less than significant, and subsequent impacts on San Joaquin County's ability to provide public services would be less than significant.

8.8.6 Growth-Inducing Impacts

The TPP is not expected to cause substantial growth-inducing impacts, as no direct or indirect relocation would result from the TPP, and no new permanent jobs would be attributable to the project. However, positive economic impacts and increased power generation capability would support future growth opportunities in the county and the region.

8.8.7 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts were identified. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

8.8.8 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Various public service agencies contacted in the course of the socioeconomics investigation to check on levels of activity and expected impacts of the proposed project are listed below.

Agency	Contact	Telephone
San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department	Bill Fellers	(209) 468-4150
San Joaquin County Auditor's Office	Ed Siojo; Angela Hou; Pat Brown	(209) 468-3925
City of Tracy Fire Department	Mark Mehring	(209) 831-4706
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Jeri Blote; Delores Ohm	(559) 498-4800
Lammersville Elementary School District	Lillian Muela	(209) 835-0138
Tracy Joint Unified School District	Anne Bell	(209) 831-5032
City of Tracy Economic Development Department	Andrew Malik	(209) 831-4104
San Joaquin County Public Health Services	Pyone Cho	(209) 468-3411
Alameda County Department of Environmental Health	Ron Browder	(510) 567-6700
State of California Department of Health Services	Dr. Raymond Neutra	(510) 622-4900
San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District	Fred Cruz	(209) 557-6456

8.8.9 Compliance with Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

Table 8.8-15 describes how the TPP will comply with applicable LORS pertaining to socioeconomic impacts, presented in Section 8.8.1.

Proposed conditions of certification are contained in Appendix K. These conditions are proposed in order to ensure compliance with applicable LORS and/or to reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

8.8.10 Permits Required and Permit Schedule

There are no permits to protect socioeconomic values, as such. See Sections 8.4 (Land Use); 8.6 (Public Health); and 8.7 (Worker Health and Safety), for permits relating to land use and public health and safety issues.

8.8.11 References

- Bell, Anne, 2001. Telephone and email communication between Anne Bell, Tracy Joint Unified School District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 11 and 16, 2001.
- Birkett, John, 2001. Fax communication between John Birkett, Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 17, 2001.
- Brandenburg, Don, 2001. Email communication between Don Brandenburg, Black & Veatch, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 29, 2001.
- Browder, Ron, 2001. Telephone communication between Ron Browder, Alameda County Department of Environmental Health, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 17, 2001.
- Brown, Pat, 2001. Telephone communication between Pat Brown, San Joaquin County Auditor's Office, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 2, 2001.
- California Department of Finance (CDF), 2001. Population and other demographics information, on CDF websites.
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.htm>.
- California Energy Commission (CEC), 2000. California Energy Commission Rationale For Adoption of Emergency Regulations to Implement to Six-Month Power Plant Licensing Process. November 15, 2000.
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Deskbook, 2001.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2001a. Labor Market Information. Current Employment and Labor Force Information.
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.htm>. and
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/FILE/LFHIST/00AASUB.TXT> and
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/lfmonth/sanjosub.txt>

- California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2001b. Labor Market Information Division. Information obtained from website. <http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/file/indhist/>
- California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2001c. Labor Market Information. Employment by Industry Data, San Joaquin County. [http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/stoc\\$haw.xls](http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/stoc$haw.xls). and <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indproj/sanjotb2.htm>.
- Cho, Pyone, 2001. Telephone communication between Pyone Cho, San Joaquin Public Health Services, and Steven Appleton, URS Corporation. July 11, 2001.
- Cruz, Fred, 2001. Telephone and email communication between Fred Cruz, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 20 and 31, 2001.
- Department of Education (DOE), 2001. State of California Department of Education. Data Quest, School and District Profiles. www.cde.ca.gov.
- Executive Order 12898. *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*. 1994.
- Fellers, Bill, 2001. Telephone and email communication between Bill Fellers, San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 2 and 20, 2001.
- Lai, Peter, 2001. Email communication between Peter Lai, GWF, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 3, 2001.
- Malik, Andrew, 2001. Telephone communication between Andrew Malik, City of Tracy Economic Development Department, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 18, 2001.
- Mehring, Mark, 2001. Telephone and fax communication between Mark Mehring, City of Tracy Fire Department, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 6, 2001.
- Muela, Lillian, 2001. Telephone communication between Lillian Muela, Lammersville School District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 6, 2001.
- Neutra, Dr. Raymond, 2001. Telephone communication between Dr. Raymond Neutra, Chief Director of Occupational and Environmental Disease Control, California Department of Health Services, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation, July 19, 2001.
- Ohm, Delores, 2001. Telephone communication between Delores Ohm, Tracy Joint Unified School District and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 5, 2001.

San Joaquin County, 2001a. Webpage for San Joaquin County. <http://www.co.san-joaquin.ca.us/regional.htm>, <http://www.co.san-joaquin.ca.us/net%5Fresources.htm>

San Joaquin County, 2001b. County of San Joaquin 2000-2001 Final Budget. Schedule 4: Summary of Estimated Additional Financing Sources (Estimated Revenue, Other Financing Sources and Residual Equity Transfers). Schedule 7: Summary of County Financing Requirements by Function & Fund. Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2001.

San Joaquin Office of Education (SJOE), 2001. Website for the San Joaquin Office of Education. <http://www.sjcoe.k12.ca.us/overview.html>.

San Joaquin Partnership (SJP), 2001. San Joaquin Partnership webpage, Demographics section. <http://www.sjpnet.org/Economic/demographics/demographics.html>, <http://www.sjpnet.org/Economic/qualityoflife/qualityoflife2.html>.

Siojo, Ed, 2001. Telephone communication between Ed Siojo, San Joaquin County Auditor's Office, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 2 and 5, 2001. Email communication between Ed Siojo and Katie McKinstry. July 3, 2001.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990. U.S. Census Data, 1990 Census. Lookup Files. Summary Tape File 3A. July, 2001. website. <http://www.census.gov/>.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000. 2000 Census. American Fact Finder website. <http://www.census.gov/>.
http://factfinder.census.gov/bf/_lang=en_vt_name=DEC_2000_PL_U_GCTPL_ST7_geo_id=04000US06.html

http://factfinder.census.gov/bf/_lang=en_vt_name=DEC_2000_PL_U_GCTPL_CO1_geo_id=05000US06077.html

U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2000a. *Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs*.

U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2000b. *Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits*.

VISTA, 2001. VISTA Information Systems, Inc. Site Assessment Reports. July 5, 2001.

TABLES

Table 8.8-1
Employment (2000)

Area	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Percent Unemployment Rate
City of Stockton	109,330	99,250	10,080	9.2
City of Lodi	31,370	29,570	1,800	5.7
City of Manteca	23,920	22,430	1,490	6.2
City of Tracy	21,250	19,870	1,380	6.5
City of Ripon	4,400	4,160	240	5.4
City of Lathrop	3,860	3,460	400	10.3
City of Escalon	2,510	2,400	110	4.5
San Joaquin County	260,900	237,900	23,000	8.8
State total	17,090,800	16,245,600	845,200	4.9

Source: EDD, 2001a. Not seasonally adjusted.

Table 8.8-2
San Joaquin County Employment

Industry	1999	Percent of Total	2000	Percent of Total	Percent Change
Total Farm	18,100	9.2	17,300	8.5	-4.4
Farm Production	11,100	5.6	10,900	5.3	-1.8
Farm Services	6,900	3.5	6,400	3.1	-7.2
Total Nonfarm	178,700	90.8	186,800	91.5	4.5
Goods Producing	34,300	17.4	37,400	18.3	9.0
Mining	100	0.1	100	0.0	0.0
Construction	10,300	5.2	11,800	5.8	14.6
Manufacturing	24,000	12.2	25,500	12.5	6.3
Service Producing	144,400	73.4	149,400	73.2	3.5
Transportation & Public Utilities	13,000	6.6	13,500	6.6	3.8
Transportation	10,500	5.3	10,800	5.3	2.9
Communications & Public Util.	2,500	1.3	2,700	1.3	8.0
Trade	41,900	21.3	43,500	21.3	3.8
Wholesale Trade	9,300	4.7	9,400	4.6	1.1
Retail Trade	32,600	16.6	34,100	16.7	4.6
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	8,500	4.3	8,400	4.1	-1.2
Services	45,400	23.1	47,000	23.0	3.5
Business Services	9,700	4.9	10,100	4.9	4.1
Amusement, Including Movies	2,600	1.3	2,800	1.4	7.7
Health Services	14,000	7.1	13,900	6.8	-0.7
Private Educational Services	3,200	1.6	3,300	1.6	3.1
Other Services	15,900	8.1	16,900	8.3	6.3
Government	35,600	18.1	37,000	18.1	3.9
Federal Government	4,000	2.0	3,800	1.9	-5.0
State Government	4,300	2.2	4,400	2.2	2.3
Local Government	27,400	13.9	28,900	14.2	5.5
Total, All Industries	196,800	100.0	204,100	100.0	3.7

Note:

Labor force data are by place of residence; data include self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike. Industry employment is by place of work; it excludes self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike.

Source: EDD, 2001b

Table 8.8-3
Available Labor by Skill in Alameda County, 1995 to 2002

Occupational Title	Annual Averages		Absolute Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Compounded Growth Rate (%)
	1995	2002			
Carpenters	3,360	3,790	430	12.8	1.73
Masons	1,460	1,690	230	15.8	2.1
Painters	1,380	1,470	90	6.5	0.91
Metal Workers	190	220	30	15.8	2.1
Electricians	2,050	2,220	170	8.3	1.14
Welders	1,290	1,450	160	12.4	1.68
Excavators	180	230	50	27.8	3.56
Graders	180	220	40	22.2	2.91
Industrial Truck Operators	5,720	5,580	140	2.4	-0.35
Operating Engineers	580	700	120	20.7	2.72
Helpers, Laborers	26,830	30,530	3,700	13.8	1.86
Pipefitters	1,180	1,280	100	8.5	1.17
Administrative Services Managers	1,550	1,700	150	9.7	1.33
Mechanical Engineers	1,370	1,790	420	30.7	3.89
Electrical Engineers	2,230	2,960	730	32.7	4.13
Engineering Technicians	6,660	7,740	1,080	16.2	2.17
Plant and System Operators	890	940	50	5.6	0.78

Source: CEDD, 2000.

Table 8.8-4
Available Labor by Skill in Three-County Area, 1995 to 2002

Occupational Title	Annual Averages		Absolute Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Compounded Growth Rate (%)
	1995	2002			
Carpenters	6,300	7,090	790	12.54	1.70
Masons	2,850	3,330	480	15.8	2.25
Painters	2,440	2,740	300	6.5	1.67
Metal Workers	310	350	40	4.6	1.75
Electricians	4,170	4,580	410	8.3	1.35
Welders	2,440	2,760	320	12.4	1.78
Excavators	420	520	100	27.8	3.10
Graders	450	530	80	22.2	2.37
Industrial Truck Operators	11,320	11,500	180	8.3	0.23
Operating Engineers	1,550	1,810	260	20.7	2.24
Helpers, Laborers	46,930	55,050	8,120	13.8	2.31
Pipefitters	2,340	2,630	290	8.5	1.68
Administrative Services Managers	2,820	3,150	330	9.7	1.59
Mechanical Engineers	1,970	2,490	520	30.7	3.40
Electrical Engineers	3,860	4,950	1,090	32.7	3.61
Engineering Technicians	10,170	11,800	1,630	16.2	2.15
Plant and System Operators	3,600	3,580	-20	11.1	-0.08

Source: CEDD, 2000.

Table 8.8-5
Historical and Projected Population Growth

Area	January 1981	April 1990	January 1999	January 2000	2010
City of Stockton	153,900	209,700	244,852	247,333	325,528
City of Lodi	35,650	51,900	57,197	57,935	71,014
City of Manteca	25,650	40,600	48,262	49,494	84,362
City of Tracy	19,250	32,450	50,553	54,240	96,270
City of Ripon	3,730	7,425	10,045	10,411	13,717
City of Lathrop	(U)	6,775	9,560	9,977	17,886
City of Escalon	3,240	4,370	5,749	5,816	9,109
Unincorporated	114,780	124,480	130,868	131,422	222,852
San Joaquin County	356,200	477,700	557,086	566,628	840,738
California	24,039,000	29,758,213	33,766,000	34,336,000	39,957,616

(U) = Unincorporated in 1981
Sources: CDF, 2001; SJP, 2001

Table 8.8-6
Annual Average Population Growth Rates

Area	Percent 1981—1990	Percent 1990 – 2000	Percent 1981 – 2000	Percent 2000 – 2010^a
City of Stockton	3.5	1.7	2.5	2.8
City of Lodi	4.3	1.1	2.6	2.1
City of Manteca	5.2	2.0	3.5	5.5
City of Tracy	6.0	5.3	5.6	5.9
City of Ripon	7.9	3.4	5.6	2.8
City of Lathrop	N/A	3.9	N/A	6.0
City of Escalon	3.4	2.9	3.1	4.6
San Joaquin County	3.3	1.7	2.5	4.0
California	2.4	1.4	1.9	1.5

^a Projected growth.

N/A = not available

Sources: CDF, 2001; SJP, 2001

Table 8.8-7
Demographic Profiles by County, City, and Census Tracts

	Number and % Minority, 1990^a		Number and % Minority by Race only, 2000^b		Number and % Hispanic/Latino, 2000		Number and % Living Below Poverty Level, 1990	
State of California	12,666,060	42.6	13,701,589	40.5	10,966,556	32.4	3,627,585	12.2
San Joaquin County	196,755	40.9	235,991	41.9	172,073	30.5	73,163	15.2
City of Tracy	10,532	31.4	19,802	34.8	15,765	27.7	2,461	7.3
CT 39	2,222	75.3	1,256	51.6	1,730	71.0	1,118	37.9
CT 52.02	674	26.7	752	26.4	689	24.2	221	8.7
CT 52.03	1,077	30.5	2,944	35.7	1,718	20.8	252	7.1
CT 52.05	871	20.8	4,448	30.1	2,716	18.4	114	2.7
CT 53.02	1545	27.2	1,953	30.4	2,075	32.3	353	6.2
CT 53.03	1362	32.2	1,563	34.4	1,884	41.5	439	10.4
CT 53.05	1354	26.9	2,189	34.6	1,630	25.8	211	4.2
CT 53.06	1113	22.5	2,533	35.8	1,974	27.9	460	9.3
CT 54.03 (54.02 in 1990)	(see CT 54.04)	(see CT 54.04)	2,053	33.2	1,531	24.8	(see CT 54.04)	(see CT 54.04)
CT 54.04 (54.02 in 1990)	3,970	46.2	2,894	44.4	3,000	46.1	807	9.4
CT 55	2,794	46.0	2,768	40.3	1,601	23.3	275	4.5
Alameda County	595,888	46.6	739,407	51.2	273,910	19.0	132,011	10.3
CT 4511.01 (4511 in 1990)	562	15.6	811	17.6	484	10.5	93	2.6

^a Includes nonwhite races, and Hispanic whites.

^b Does not account for Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Includes persons listed as only one race and Black or African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or some other race; and includes persons listed as more than one race.

CT = census tract

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

Table 8.8-8
Local and Regional Housing Estimates (January 2000)

Community	Housing Units	Occupied	Percent Vacancy
City of Stockton	81,621	77,378	5.20
City of Lodi	21,442	20,707	3.43
City of Manteca	16,523	15,883	3.87
City of Tracy	18,457	16,992	7.94
City of Ripon	3,440	3,304	3.95
City of Lathrop	2,978	2,813	5.54
City of Escalon	2,052	1,996	2.73
San Joaquin County	190,003	180,531	4.99
State of California	12,242,576	11,335,419	7.41

Source: CDF, 2001

Table 8.8-9
Schools in the Vicinity of the Project Site

School Districts Near the Project Site				
School District/School	2000/2001 Enrollment	Enrollment Capacity	Over Capacity?	Projection 2001/2002
Lammersville Elementary School District	298	350	No	300
Lammersville Charter School (Home schooling program)	7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lammersville Elementary School (K-8)	281	350	No	280
Tracy Joint Unified School District	13,816	15,760/15,895 ²	No	14,945
Bohn (Louis A.) Elementary School	550	601	No	594
Central Elementary School	500	601	No	531
Clover (H. Alfred) Middle School	642	593	Yes	635
Delta Island Elementary School	188	229	No	202
Duncan-Russell Continuation High School	130	189	No	135
Excel High Continuation School	11	N/A	N/A	N/A
Freiler Elementary School ¹	N/A	825	No	541
Hirsch (Wanda) Elementary School	863	750	Yes	924
Jacobson (Melville S.) Elementary School ¹	937	714	No	696
McKinley Elementary School	614	525	Yes	623
Monte Vista Middle School	872	1,090	No	946
North Elementary School	473	526	No	496
Poet-Christian (Gladys) Elementary School	670	798	No	698
South/West Park Elementary School	1,066	1,275	No	1,128
Success High Continuation School	11	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tracy High School	2,004	2,181	No	2,139
Villalovoz (Louis J.) Elementary School	724	726	Yes	751
West (Merrill F.) High School	2,235	2,532	No	2,464
Williams (Earle E.) Middle School	1,299	1,389	No	1,317
TLC/Discovery Charter School ²	N/A	216/351	No	125
Willow Community School ³	27	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

¹ Some of the students enrolled at Jacobson Elementary will be attending Freiler Elementary, which will open for the 2001/2002 school year.

² Capacity for TLC/Discovery Charter School will be 351 during the 2002/2003 school year.

³ Willow Community School is operating out of a commercial rental property on Tracy Boulevard; capacity and projected enrollment were not available.

N/A = Not applicable.

Sources: DOE, 2001; Muela, 2001; Bell, 2001.

Table 8.8-10
San Joaquin County Summary of Estimated Additional Financing Sources (\$ millions)

Revenue Source	Actual 1998/1999	Actual 1999/2000	Adopted 2000/2001	Percent Change 1999/2000 to 2000/2001	Estimated 2001/2002^a	Estimated 2002/2003^a
Taxes	73.5	78.0	89.2	14.4%	102.0	116.7
Licenses, Permits, and Franchises	3.4	3.8	4.0	5.3%	4.2	4.4
Fines, Forfeitures, and Penalties	6.6	7.0	6.9	-1.4%	6.8	6.7
Revenue from Use of Money and Property	10.0	9.3	9.5	2.2%	9.7	9.9
State	228.0	240.5	276.7	15.1%	318.3	366.3
Federal	133.9	135.3	155.7	15.1%	179.2	206.2
Other	1.1	1.3	1.8	38.5%	2.5	3.5
Charges for Services	62.7	68.2	72.0	5.6%	76.0	80.2
Miscellaneous Revenues	6.2	8.4	8.9	6.0%	9.4	10.0
Other Financing Sources	49.5	67.8	110.5	63.0%	180.1	293.5
Total:	574.8	619.6	735.1	18.6%	872.1	1034.7

^a The estimated revenues for 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 were based on the average annual percent change between 1998/1999 and 2000/2001 listed above and the adopted revenues for 2000/2001.

Numbers may not add exactly due to rounding.

Source: San Joaquin County, 2001d

Table 8.8-11
San Joaquin County Budget Appropriations (\$ millions)

Department	FY 1999/2000 Actual Appropriations	FY 2000/2001 Adopted Appropriations	Percent Change	Percentage of Funds, 2000/2001
General Government	81.5	149.1	82.9%	19.4%
Public Protection	148.6	156.3	5.2%	20.3%
Public Ways & Facilities	35.2	59.0	67.6%	7.7%
Health & Sanitation	126.7	151.6	19.7%	19.7%
Public Assistance	206.3	240.1	16.4%	31.2%
Education	3.6	3.9	8.3%	0.5%
Recreation	2.9	3.1	6.9%	0.4%
Contingency Reserve	0.4	6.7	1575.0%	0.9%
Total Financing Requirements	605.2	769.7	27.2%	100.0%

FY = Fiscal Year

Source: San Joaquin County, 2001b

Table 8.8-12
Construction and Closeout Personnel Requirements by Trade
Month of Construction

Craft or Trade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total Person-Months
Insulation Workers							18.6	4.5				23.1
Boilermakers				10.9	48.1	32.7	22.6	8.6				122.9
Carpenters		7.6	9.7	4.2								21.5
Electricians			25.4	41.2	40.9	29.5	10.7					147.7
Ironworkers		12.5	15.9	6.9	5.1	7.7	6.3	2.4				56.8
Laborers	23.5	40.1	25.8	5.5								94.9
Millwrights					12.4	16.5	9.9	3.4				42.2
Plasterers		2.4	3.1	1.3								6.8
Painters							7.4	1.8				9.2
Pipefitters			13	21.6	31.4	21.6	3.1					90.7
Teamsters	5.9	7.5	3.2									16.6
Direct Craft	29.4	70.1	96.1	91.6	137.9	108	78.6	20.7				632.4
Indirect Craft	7.4	10.5	17.7	21.7	22.3	19.6	17.7	13.7	9.4	8	5	153
Startup Craft					0.4	2.1	5.1	6	8.3			21.9
Construction Management	12	14	15	17.3	17.8	18.9	17	17	12	11	7	159
Total Site Staff	48.8	94.6	128.8	130.6	178.4	148.6	118.4	57.4	29.7	19	12	966.3

Notes:

All workers listed in Table 8.8-10 are on-site workers. Direct craft represents workers preparing the site and erecting equipment. Indirect craft represents workers who will support the direct craft. Startup craft includes workers who support direct craft during startup activities (Brandenburg, 2001).

Table 8.8-13
Construction Cost

Type	Cost
Labor	\$13.3 million
Materials	\$71.2 million
Other nonlabor costs	\$22.6 million
Total Construction Cost	\$107.1 million

Source: Lai, 2001.

Table 8.8-14
Annual Operation Cost

Type	Cost
Production Labor	\$140,000
Contract Labor, Materials, and Supplies	\$2,700,000
Total Cost of Annual Operation	\$2,840,000

Source: Lai, 2001.

Table 8.8-15
TPP Summary of Compliance with Socioeconomic LORS

Authority	Administering Agency	Requirements	TPP Compliance
Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice	U.S. EPA	Agencies must develop strategies to focus on environmental conditions and human health in minority communities and low-income populations.	Section 8.8.4 – Environmental Justice. Project would not result in disproportionate impacts to low-income or minority populations.
CEQA	CEC	Analysis of potential environmental impacts in Applications for Certification (AFC).	Section 8.8.3 – Environmental Consequences. Environmental impacts (economic and/or social effects) are analyzed in the AFC.
California Government Code, Sections 53080, 65955–65997	San Joaquin County	Provisions for school impact fees for development projects near school districts are included.	Sections 8.8.2.3 (Affected Environment, Schools); and 8.8.3.5 (Environmental Consequences, Fiscal Impacts). School development fees would be levied against the project.

FIGURES